translation of the foreign priority document along with a statement of accuracy of the translation to obviate the rejection in view of Inaguma. Applicant respectfully submits that the Inaguma reference can no longer be used as prior art against the present application. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection in view of Inaguma.

The Examiner rejects claims 29, 30 and 34-38 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Yuuichi (JP 8-104246) in view of Kobayashi, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,645,107); and claims 39 and 74-84 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Yuuichi and Kobayashi in further view of applicant's admitted prior art. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant, for purposes of brevity, hereby incorporate the arguments presented in the response dated October 28, 2002, in regard to the above rejections.

The Examiner maintains his allegation that the combination of Yuuichi discloses all of the claimed features recited in independent claims 29 and 39 except that the device of Yuuichi includes chamfers on both of the valve spool and valve body. The Examiner alleges that Kobayashi makes up for the deficiencies of Yuuichi and the combination of Kobayashi with Yuuichi provides applicant's claimed combination.

Applicant's independent claims 29 and 39 each recite, *inter alia*, "wherein only one of said valve body and said valve spool includes pairs of chamfers which are so formed that each of ones of the valve body lands and the

valve spool lands has only one chamfer" (emphasis added). Applicant notes that the main reference, Yuuichi, on which the Examiner relies upon in his rejection, teaches the use of chamfers on **both** the valve body land and valve body spool. See Figs. 1-8. As correctly stated by the Examiner, Yuuichi fails to suggest or disclose chamfers in which only one of the valve body and valve spool include pairs of chamfers.

One of ordinary skill would not combine the teachings of Kobayashi with Yuucihi. Yuucihi does not teach or suggest an arrangement of the valve body and valve spool in which only one of the valve body or valve spool contains a chamfer arrangement. The design of chamfer arrangement is specific to Yuuichi having chamfers on both the valve body and valve spool in order to achieve the desired operational characteristics for the hydraulic valve. Since Yuuichi teaches only the use of chamfers on both the valve spool and valve body and the hydraulic characteristics are dependent upon having chamfers on both the valve spool and valve body, then the teachings of Yuuichi is related to using chamfers on both the valve body and valve spool and not on only one or the other. Thus, the combination of Yuucihi's teachings with any other reference would include the use of chamfers on both the valve spool and valve body.

Although Kobayashi teaches the use of chamfers on only one of a valve body or valve spool, it does not teach or suggest the specific arrangement claimed by applicant. Further, the Examiner argues that Kobayshi illustrates a myriad of chamfer arrangements, which would lead one of ordinary skill to use

relative routine experimentation to achieve applicant's invention. Applicant submits, however, that any combination of Yuucihi with Kobayshi would lead to a chamfer arrangement on both the valve body and valve spool. Among the myriad of chamfer arrangements, Kobayshi teaches the use of chamfers on both the valve body and valve spool along with a chamfer arrangement on only the valve body or valve spool. One of ordinary skill in the art when combing the teachings of Yuuichi with Kobayshi is not going to look at the chamfer arrangement on only one of the valve spool or valve body in combining the teachings of the references. One of ordinary skill is going to look at the chamfer arrangement on both the valve body and valve spool, because that is what Yuuichi teaches and that is an aspect taught by Kobayshi.

Furthermore, although a myriad of chamfer arrangements are illustrated in the various references, each chamfer arrangement has been specifically created to achieve a specific result and are not merely whimsically rearranged to illustrate various chamfer arrangements. As in the present invention, the specific chamfer arrangement, which is neither suggested or disclosed in the combination of references, is provided to achieve a specific result to enhance the hydraulic performance from those of previous hydraulic systems. The combination of references do not teach the specific chamfer arrangement claimed by applicant on only one of the valve body or valve spool.

In view of the above, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

CONCLUSION

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 29, 30, 34-39 and 74-84 are distinguishable over the cited references. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicant respectfully petitions for a one (1) month extension of time for filing a reply in connection with the present application, and the required fee of $110.00 is attached hereto.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is necessary in order to place this application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Chad Billings (Pat. Reg. No. 48,917) at 1-703-205-8001.

If necessary, the Commissioner of hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

#40,439

By: _____

Michael K. Mutter
Reg. No. 29,680

MKM/CJB:cb
(703) 205-8000

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747